

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

EDWARD COTRELLE TIDWELL,

No. C 17-00437 WHA

Plaintiff,

v.

CARRINGTON REAL ESTATE
SERVICES (US), LLC, *et al.*,

**ORDER DENYING
PLAINTIFF'S APPLICATION
FOR TEMPORARY
RESTRAINING ORDER**


Defendants.

Plaintiff's application for a temporary restraining order (Dkt. No. 18), to the extent comprehensible, is based on an underlying unlawful detainer action and writs issued by the state court on November 8, 2011 (although plaintiff states "it is overwhelmingly evident the Lord Jesus Christ has intervened thereby causing the November 8, 2011 Writ to expire"); August 22, 2016; and March 10, 2017 (*see id.* at 2, 4, 6, 10). The application is **DENIED**. Plaintiff currently resides in the property at issue (*id.* at 9). Nothing that allegedly happened in the recent past indicates the underlying unlawful detainer action threatens imminent and immediate eviction (*see, e.g., id.* at 3–4). Even if it did, due process has been satisfied by the due process supplied by the state court. To the extent that plaintiff has a grievance with a writ issued by the state court or an ongoing unlawful detainer action against him, he should direct those grievances to the state court, not federal court.

1 If plaintiff proposes to pursue this federal action, then this denial of a temporary
2 restraining order is without prejudice to a motion, properly made and served, for a preliminary
3 injunction directed at the proper defendants. So advising, this order does not suggest that such a
4 motion could be brought in good faith.

5
6 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

7
8 Dated: March 15, 2017.

9 
10 WILLIAM ALSUP
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28